



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/660,183

09/11/2003

Sebastien Perrot

PF020113

5791

24498

7590

04/18/2008

Joseph J. Laks

Thomson Licensing LLC

2 Independence Way, Patent Operations

PO Box 5312

PRINCETON, NJ 08543

EXAMINER

TSEGAYE, SABA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2619

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/18/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues (Remarks, pages 8-9) that Bender does not disclose or suggest at least *“a bridge device for separately registering to the access point with the respective addresses of a device and a bridge device, the device and itself as wireless devices on a wireless network...”* examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant contention. Bender clearly discloses that "... the terminal unit 40, as well as the wireless modem 42, must be assigned an IP address so that each may be addressed individually within the system... in addition, the use of independent IP addresses allows the terminal equipment unit 40 and the wireless modem 42 to exchange IP messages intended for one another.” See page 9, lines 8-12.

Still on page 9, Applicant argues that *Bender does not disclose registering to an access point wit the respective addresses, the device and itself as wireless devices on the wireless network, wherein the registration is performed thorough and authentication and an association process of the type as defined by the IEEE 802.11 standard, essentially as claimed in claims 1, 14, 15 and 16.* It is respectfully submitted that the rejection is based on the combined teaching of Bender reference and the Admitted prior art (APA). Bender discloses that the terminal 40 and the wireless modem 42 are assigned IP address so that each may be **addressed individually** and communicate to the network unit 58 over the wireless link. APA assists that “it is known for wireless network to use IEEE 802.11 specification to allow stations on the wireless network to exchange data.”

Still on page 9, Applicant argues that Bender does NOT disclose that *“the wireless modem connects terminal equipments to the wireless network.”* Examiner respectfully disagrees. As admitted by Applicant (Remarks, page 8, last paragraph) that “the terminal equipment unit 40

communicate to the network unit 58 over the wireless link, through the **wireless modem**.” Fig. 3A shows that the terminal 40 and the wireless modem 42 are connected to network unit 58 through the wireless network. Further, Bender discloses that the wireless modem 42 is defined as a gateway between the Ethernet subnet and the external network (page 10 lines 22-23).

Still on page 9, Applicant argues that APA fails to disclose or suggest “*separately registering to the access point with the respective addresses, the device and itself as wireless devices on the wireless network...*” it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is based on the combined teaching of the Bender reference and the APA, and that the Bender reference, as pointed out above does teach this feature.

On page 10, Applicant argues that “...there is no relationship between that hardware address and the present invention’s method which uses a MAC address to registry the device as a wireless device...” Examiner respectfully disagrees. Bender discloses that both the terminal equipment unit 40 and the wireless modem 42 use their unique hardware address to request a separate IP address. Also, it is well known in the art that a MAC address is a hardware address that uniquely identifies each node of a network. Examiner believes that the claims, given their broad reasonable interpretation, read on the references applied.